(2) (6) C.S. 1001 — SINGLE BENCH

BEFORE THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR.

W.P.(S) NO..2626.....2006

PETITIONER - Ku. Suraiya Bano, aged 35 years
D/o John Mohammad
R/o MIG-I-632
HUDCO, AMDI NAGAR, BHILAI
P.O. TAH. & DISTT. DURG (C.G.)

P.R. No. 670 2/06
Presented by Shri S. Agrawal
dated 24-11-06

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS (1) Chairman,
Governing Body, Chhattisgarh Kalyan Samiti, Kalyan Mahaivydlaya Sector-7
Bhilainagar, distt. Durg (C.G.)

RECEIVED COPY 24/11/06 CLERK to A.G. BILASPUR

(2) Principal
Kalyan Mahavidyalaya Sector-7
Bhilainagar, Distt. Durg (C.G.)

(3) Ku. Chhama Soni
Department of Electronics and Information Technology, Kalyan Mahavidyalaya Sector-7
Bhilainagar, Distt. Durg (C.G.)

(4) State of Chhattisgarh,
Through – The Secretary,
General Administration Department,
D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)

Writ Petition Under Articles 226/~~227~~ of The Constitution Of India for the issuance of WRIT in the nature of MANDAMUS certiorari, Prohibition and for other suitable writ or writs, order or orders, direction or directions.

(98)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition (S) No. 7626 of 2006

Petitioner — Ku. Suraiya Bano

Versus

Respondents — Chairman, Governing Body, Chhattisgarh Kalyan Samiti & others

Single Bench: Hon'ble Mr. Justice **Satish K. Agnihotri.**

Present: Shri G.L. Yadu, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mrs. Anju Ahuja, Deputy Government Advocate for the respondents/State.

O R D E R

(Passed on 15th Day of January, 2007)

The following order of the Court was passed by **Satish K. Agnihotri, J.**

1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was appointed on temporary basis for a sum of Rs. 2000/- vide order dated 11.8.2000 (Annexure P-1). Thereafter, several orders were passed, appointing the petitioner on temporary basis for 89 days. Finally, engagement of the petitioner as temporary basis was discontinued by the order dated 29.3.2005 (Annexure P/16) w.e.f. 31st March, 2005 on the ground that services of the temporary basis employee was 'no longer required'.

2. The petitioner has filed this petition for quashing the impugning order dated 29.3.2005 (Annexure P/16) on the ground that the

Sd/-
Satish K.Agnihotri
Judge